# IMC Meeting Minutes:  08-18-2006

Minutes transcribed by Georgia Frueh, OIT staff.

## I.  Call to Order:  1:35 pm – Chairman Picanso

IMC Commissioner attendance:  Delmonico, Dennis, Lutz, Malinowski, May, Monkman, Picanso, VanDerSchouw (via teleconference).

Introduction of Commissioners and audience members.

Chairman Picanso announced that a quorum is present.

### A.    Chairman's Remarks

Chairman Picanso opened the meeting with an announcement that a quorum is present.  He informed the Commissioners of the following additional documents in their Briefing Notebooks and made brief comments on each item:

- Commissioner Briefing Notebooks, Section 1, include the following additional documents:
- OIT Draft letter to the Executive Directors and CIO regarding RED status projects.
- Human Services DVR RISE Project responses to the IMC's three questions from the Risk Management Subcommittee readout in July 2006.
- The August 2006 OIT e-Newsletter
- CY 2006 Monthly Meeting Dates schedule.  Mr. Weatherford, Colorado Information Security Officer, will be presenting in the September or October meeting on some activities surrounding Cyber Security – this will be an Executive Session.
- The updated IMC Directory.

### B. Meeting Minutes

Chairman Picanso called for a motion to accept the July 21, 2006 Meeting Minutes, as well as the May 19, 2006 Meeting Minutes and IT Policies and Standards adopted in the June 16, 2006 meeting.  A motion was made and seconded - there was no discussion.  All documents were approved unanimously.

| Motion | Motion: Commissioner Malinowski;  2nd:  Secretary of State Dennis |
| --- | --- |

To approve the meeting minutes from the July 2006 IMC meeting, as well as the Meeting Minutes and IT Policies and Standards adopted in the June 16, 2006 IMC meeting.
Approved unanimously.

Chairman Picanso also asked for clarification that Vice-Chairman Mulford, in the June 2006 IMC meeting, had requested adoption of the IT Policies and Standards proposed.  Elain Radford, OIT staff, confirmed that Vice-Chairman Mulford had done so, and that the Commission did take a vote at that time.  However, there were seven (7) Commissioners present, not eight (8) as the IMC has historically used for a quorum.  Chairman Picanso stated for clarification that it was determined through a letter he sent out a few months ago, that a "quorum" number equals eight.  He further stated that as of July 1, 2006, in OIT/IMC legislation there are now a total of 15 IMC Commissioners (no longer 17 members) and a quorum of the 15 members would be eight (8).

## C. Motions and Action Items

Chairman Picanso called forward Daniel Sullivan, OIT staff, to provide the Commission with a review and discussion of the July 21, 2006 Motions and Action Items list. Daniel facilitated the review of each action item, emphasizing that the majority have been completed and provided comments on those that are still in-progress.

Regarding Action Item #9: Commissioner Malinowski asked that the update on the MNT Annual Report be postponed until the October 2006 meeting, as they are still in the process of gathering additional data. Chairman Picanso asked for discussion. There was no discussion, so this request was accepted.

Senator May asked if Commissioner Malinowski was getting cooperation from Qwest. Commissioner Malinowski confirmed that they were getting very good cooperation from Qwest. He stated that they met with Qwest because they were having a cross-channel problem, with several vendors contacting the same potential customers. After meeting with their executives, it has been agreed that when it comes to the MNT, "we'll be the point of contact" and the problem has been taken care of.

Chairman Picanso reiterated for the record that a vote was taken on the IT Standards and Policies in June 2006, however, there was a question on how many voting members make up a quorum. He clarified, should there be any question, there is now a legitimate full quorum present and this item was re-introduced today and approved with a full quorum.

## II. Old Business

Chairman Picanso called forward Elain Radford, OIT staff, to present the IMC Executive Monthly Project Dashboard Report.

### 1. IMC Executive Monthly Project Dashboard Report

Elain noted that the IMC Executive Project Dashboard is in the Commissioner's Briefing Notebooks. She informed the Commission that one project was added to the Dashboard: the DPA–DoIT Capitol Complex VOIP. Elain stated that two projects remain in RED Status: the CDHS-DVR Rise Project, and the CDLE genesis Re-Engineering Project, which is on hold pending their project recovery assessment (PRA) efforts and the PRA is targeting January for the results of their assessment.

Elain commented on those projects in YELLOW status and noted there are five projects currently in YELLOW Status – several of which presented to the Risk Management Subcommittee this morning:

- CDLE genesis Project Recovery Assessment (PRA) Project is scheduled to present to the full Commission in September 2006.
- CDOT ERP Project remains in YELLOW status and will present to the full Commission this afternoon.
- DOR CSTARS Project did present to the Risk Management Subcommittee in the morning and reported some improved efforts toward launching at the state within the next week or so.
- HCPF – MMIS Re-Procurement Project remains in YELLOW status and will present to both the Risk Management Sub-committee and full Commission in September.

- The DOS HAVA/SCORE Project remains in YELLOW status though they reported to the Risk Management Subcommittee this morning and were able to report significant improvement and progress, and it looks like they will be moving into GREEN status very soon.

Elain informed the Commission that, in September 2006, there would be approximately six (6) new projects added to the Dashboard. Senator May emphasized that he wanted it to be made very clear, on the issue of projects being in the RED or the GREEN or the YELLOW status, it is not the Commission's intent to chastise people on those projects in the RED – but rather it is a way of tracking a project and to help the project move into a GREEN status. Chairman Picanso thanked Senator May for making a very good point and asked for any further discussion. No discussion followed.

2. **Projects Readouts**

Elain Radford called forward Dr. John Witwer, Director of the Office of CBMS, and Ron Huston, CDHS CIO, to present on the CBMS Project.

Dr. Witwer provided a handout of their presentation. He provided a detailed overview of his slide presentation. Dr. Witwer emphasized that one of the goals of CBMS was to have an increase in the number of programs per client, and this goal is being achieved and has increased by 16 % since they went live on September 1, 2004. He further stated that in the first year of CBMS there were 705,000 clients identified with open approved benefits. Dr. Witwer stated that, regarding emergency calls, the first week of August 2006 they had the lowest number of incident calls they have ever had.

Ron Huston provided an overview of the Help Desk Services Study, and stated a Committee was established to analyze service levels of the Help Desk, which included participants from the Department of Human Services, Health Care Policy and Financing, the Office of CBMS and the counties. Results of their analysis was that of the 164 service issues identified, 76% of issues raised have had a solution designed, and only 39 issues raised remain in need of a solution. Ron emphasized they realized one very simple solution was in the education all of the users on how the Help Desk works. That the Help Desk was a shock to some of the users and they never understood the amount of work involved and how the help desk works. Ron further stated that they have also been able to identify trends.

Dr. Witwer provided a brief overview of the System Improvements and Change requests as of August 14, 2006. He stated the State did accept the EDS system on 630 of those six, which required an active and aggressive amount of work on the part of State folks and EDS in order to resolve those issues.

Senator May asked about those issues and objects that were to be programmed and completed, but were laid aside during the development with the intent of bringing them on at a later date. Senator May asked if these issues would be handled through the normal IMC process. He asked if CBMS intended to ask for additional monies for those items, how many items there are, and how did they plan to group those together and handle them. Dr. Witwer responded there were significant issues with client correspondence and with some interfaces, i.e. the BENDEX Interface, which is the Social Security Administration interface, and the

SDX interface. He stated both those interfaces had been put on hold in December 2004, but since have been re-implemented and are successful. Another related successful implementation is SOLQ, (State Online Query) which has been very, very successful. Just to give you a handle on the client correspondence – that was a four-part upgrade and we finished it in February of this year. That was to roll up notices across the months, roll up notices across actions, roll up notices across high level program groups as well as the level of the worker and payee and produce a summary of eligibility – just to give you an idea of why client correspondence was a significant issue: there were at the time, over that period of time, 672,000 clients receiving an average of 6.4 notices a year – that's cranking out 4.325 million notices a year, and the average COLA is 300,000 notices.

Ron Huston interjected at this point to emphasize SOLQ and the rigorous certification that the state has to go through – Colorado was the 4th state to get that certification. He stated that it is "very very unusual."

Senator May asked if the funding was done on the original contract, and Ron responded, no. There was discussion and an explanation of the funding. Dr. Witwer offered a breakdown to Senator May. More discussion followed with Mr. Huston summarizing that the "fires are over." Referring to the list of Improvements/Enhancements.

Dr. Witwer went on to summarize the Future System Improvement Examples, CBMS Training, and that there has been a significant amount of requests for the training and they have been working very aggressively to upgrade the training, not only CBMS, but on putting in policy consideration so that the case workers will understand the policy.

Dr. Witwer reviewed the Court Update, emphasizing the major issue of overpayments related to that occur after June 1, 2006. There has been an active work on addressing overpayments related to computer system as well as training issues related to the counties. He also stated that the court trial date was vacated and not rescheduled. Plaintiffs have asked the court for permission to file a new 4th amended complaint. State's response is on hold pending outcome of current settlement negotiations between parties.

In closing, Dr. Witwer stated that there has been marked progress and the system is now under control – progress will continue as there are still significant areas that need to be addressed. He said to remember that not all complaints are computer related and that there are safety nets available and phone numbers for the clients.

Chairman Picanso opened the floor for questions.

Commissioner Delmonico asked how to speed and implement changes that are being asked for out of the legislative body – "do you have any tracking figures/ statistics on the speed to implement and improvement in the ability to respond?"

Dr. Witwer responded that the issue has always been the cost to implement – "we have not actually been able to do that – we've done it on a rough basis, but not in a formalized basis, but I think it's one we do need to do. Under the circumstances, simple decision tables and reference tables are fairly simple to implement, however what is interesting is that some of the requests that we find are much, much broader because they may require a whole new high level program group to implement something across multiple program levels. So what

we thought might be easy for some of the functions is the case but for broader implementation across multiple program levels is more significant."

Senator May acknowledged the spectacular job done by Ron Huston and Dr. Witwer. He then made the suggestion that before "you split your team up, the ideas they have for implementation – major problem has been implementation – so anything you have learned from that to better implement the system, we would like to capture from you."

Ron Huston acknowledged Senator May's vote of support and a phenomenal job well done by the staff on the project, and emphasized that he and Dr. Witwer are very lucky to have had such an excellent staff. He went on to express "a short editorial" in that it is a much broader issue – an example he's used numerous times: the lowest bid on CBMS was $218, 000,000 dollars, and this state settled for a contract of $94, 000,000 dollars. "Bottom line for me – that's the first and biggest problem. I asked for two dollars and I get a dollar so you get what you get."

Dr. Witwer stated that they were blessed with a phenomenal staff. The legislature stepped up and allowed them to create a single point of authority and that the state is very fortunate to have such a high level, intelligent, dedicated and experience group of people. He recommended getting a handle on Change Management, maintain the funding and the resources, and then communications.

Senator May asked Dr. Witwer "regarding the 1800 counselors in 64 counties – how are they trained? Is there a turnover? Is there a state training program?" Dr. Witwer responded that he categorized the training in two different areas:
1. As additional enhancement, modification fixes that are occurring in the system are areas that are found as weaknesses in knowledge, there is training there, and
2. In regard to the turnover, the list shows a whole list of classes - starting out with a CBT class. He then went on to say that there are training facilities in the Springs, Grand Junction, Northglenn as well as regional training in various areas around the state. He also referred to the workbook in addition to hands-on training the new hires receive.

Commissioner Delmonico referred to Ron Huston's statement about "getting a dollar when he asked for two" and said she would like to challenge the state overall and that she thinks the real expenditure is three dollars if you track it to the one dollar mark – the reason she is going to add on to that is because "we don't track all of the significant costs that go on in trying to be too frugal." There is a significant amount of costs that go on, such as court costs and so forth, and that we are "penny wise and pound foolish."

Senator May mentioned an upcoming event happening in Scottsdale, AZ in December 2006 in which Ron Huston will be presenting. "Many states are interested and excited about it and that we are on the leading edge in this."

Chairman Picanso then asked Ms. Radford to announce the next project, and Elain called forward Commissioner Malinowski and Mary Lou Lacouture to present on the Capitol Complex VOIP Telephony and Network Convergence Project.

Mary Lou Lacouture, Project Manager, provided a review of the project's Monthly Status Report. She stated that, now that the RFP has been approved, they have the opportunity to go into Phase II, which is the details and the "real meat of this project" – lease negotiations, maintenance contract negotiations, final network and system architecture development, etc.

Commissioner Malinowski referred to project funding and that it would be taken out of base funds and that this is a lease of moving forward in terms of new technology, so they shouldn't be requesting any additional funds for it. He wanted to bring it before the Commission because over a ten year period it's probably a Ten Million Dollar project.

Commissioner Lutz asked if there was a significant cost savings, given that it was being taken out of base funds, and what is the magnitude of that? Mary Lou Lacouture responded that they expect to benefit from some cost savings from the new technology, however until they have those final design components and understanding of the new administration. What they're doing is: instead of managing two separate networks they will be managing one network, and there is considerable cost savings when one moves from a hardware specific technology to a software specific technology. They do expect opportunity for savings and cost avoidance with this new technology in this new Project. Hopefully they can share some specific numbers with the Commission as we flesh out the project plan and implementation plan.

Senator May asked if new legislation would be needed for this. Commissioner Malinowski responded that "no, I don't believe so," and that they were already doing the work today. It is a lease of a new system as opposed to creating something new. It's already in the base process, covered by our existing statutes. Senator May asked if they have cable agreements by city/county – or any voice over IP through those cable systems? Commissioner Malinowski said that they would be running the vast majority over the existing fiber networks "we own ourselves" or over the Multi-Use Network - no new legislation will be needed.

Mary Lou Lacouture added that there is significant opportunity for savings if they were to do a capital lease rather than an operating lease, and it is her understanding that to do a capital lease it would have to be included as a line item on the Long Bill and they would be asking for that as a supplemental in December, so the legislators may be involved because it appears that the cost savings is significant – $250,000 a year for ten years.

Senator May commented that Texas passed legislation to require a state franchise for cable prior to their negotiating with the local government. He suggested that it might be something to look at. Commissioner Malinowski thanked the Senator for pointing that out, and further stated "As we go forward on the negotiations and see exactly what the networks look like, if that becomes an issue we will certainly be prepared to identify it."

There was no more discussion and Chairman Picanso asked Elain Radford to introduce the next Project presentation.

Elain called forward Ron Huston, CDHS CIO, and John Daurio, CDHS Regional Manager, to present on the CDHS-DVR RISE Project.

Ron Huston began the presentation by referring to the last meeting in July when the project was in RED status. He stated that they were preparing a default letter to the vendor regarding two key problem areas of staffing and deliverables:

1. Staffing: Identified individuals to be hired and all have been interviewed and accepted with the exception of one who will be scheduled. In addition the vendor is transferring an individual who recently finished a project in Florida and will be starting here next week. Ron went on to say that they've met with the individual who turned out NOT to be the president of the company but the President of the North American Government Division. This person has also hired an additional person who has been on the board for a week. This individual flew in to have a meeting face-to-face and when he finished he also met with the staff. Ron continued, saying that "we have had multiple good meetings/ conference calls with and we have agreed to a conference call or face-to-face meeting with him once a week."

2. Deliverables: Ron stated that since we met the last time we reported that 12 deliverables were due and can now report that 11 of those either came in on time or slightly ahead of schedule. We have one deliverable that was delivered late, and we now as of this Wednesday, have had a deliverable that we have rejected.

Ron continued and stated, "Frustrations are still high, but we are heavily managing them." Referring to the default letter drafted last month, Ron stated that based on guidance from their contract manager for the Department and the Attorney General's office, they turned it into a "letter of concern" and with it a Contract Amendment which incorporated the Recovery Plan schedule. The vendor was given five days to respond and sign in agreement, and the contract actually made it to India and back on the due date.

Ron Huston went on to say that they were able to "escalate up" and have since learned who this President's superior is - the head of the North American Operations who is also a corporate officer of the company. We have had communications with this individual by letter, and have received the offer from him to phone conference as well as to visit on-site. However, at this point, "John and I have not elected to exercise direct conversations with him."

In closing, Ron stated that "progress is being made, and at this point we are working diligently with the contractor. I actually believe that given what we've seen over the last week, we are truly getting they're attention." Ron went on to give high praise to the state staff, and Nancy Smith, in particular, with the excellent leadership she is providing to the team as project sponsor.

No discussion followed and Chairman Picanso asked Elain Radford to introduce the next Project.

Elain called forward Doug Lang-CDOT CIO, Andres Kukawka-Project Manager, and Kim Hallsted-IV&V

Doug Lang began the presentation by stating that their Project is in YELLOW status, and right now we are just over two months away from our "go live" date. Current activities focus on wrapping up our testing cycles. We are one week away from completing our third cycle

of Integration testing which actually occurs in three cycles three weeks each. Preceding that was String testing and preceding that was Unit testing and we're hammering that really hard and it's going very well.  He stated that other activities they're ramping up for are training and starting the process of finalizing our cut-over.

Doug explained that the reason for YELLOW status  is due to a number of issues, a couple of them related to training – we got a slow start on that but we're on board currently and up to speed.  Our business data warehouse – we would characterize that in the same mode in that we developed specification for our reports a little bit later then we anticipated, but those will all be expected to be delivered on our "go live."  The biggest issues we're facing right now – we've just re-planned and gotten a commitment on our resources, which was pretty much our constraint, was for our budget preparation portion of the software piece. Our revenue projections, our resource allocation tools, things having to do with long-range transportation planning and the way we run our budget.  It is a four-year plan and we update it every two years.  Our testing process identified that the quality and completeness was not what we expected at this point in time.  We are competing internally with some very scarce resources and have some expertise currently working on some other projects like year-end close and we're in the initial stages of a new transportation planning cycle – in which case it's a real intense effort to do revenue projections (for 35 years) so that we can come up with a constrained transportation plan.  We also need these same resources in order to complete our configuration and testing on the budget preparation tool I've just described.  So we have re-planned that, we have commitments from the process owner that those resources will be available and we believe that we'll be able to "sneak that in under the wire."

He also noted that their interfaces have been a challenge in the state system and some external systems – a challenge because we just wrapped up (we think) an interface which underwent some significant changes recently and "it was like hitting a moving target."  We believe at this point we do have a solid interface and we're finishing up testing with tha,t and our expectation is that at the end of this month we'll be able to "flip that switch" and start utilizing that  interface. Right now our work-around is dual data entry.

Chairman Picanso asked if it is dual data entry for all the interfaces, for the most part or a significant amount?   Doug replied that they went live with a portion of their system in April and that would be the interface he was just referring to.  "We've been doing double entries since April, especially for new hires.  Our ability to get that into COFRS, etc. and get that information back has been requiring us to enter it in both our systems.

Andres Kukawka interjected at this point and added that if this interface is not in place after November 1st, then each one of them will require double entry to our SAP and to the other system.  Senator May asked if ERP is worth looking into for us to use in some of our other projects and departments at the state?  Doug Lang responded that, yes, in his professional opinion – our existing COFRS system is over twenty years old and as such has limitations. We find that the integration that is offered with the ERP system ties together in our case, with project scheduling, getting transportation projects scheduled, built, out to bid and constructed, interfaced into that with our payments associated with those projects.  Our plant maintenance since over half of our operation is doing roadway maintenance, etc.  He went on to say that he would highly recommend that we consider that for the future.

Chairman Picanso pointed out here that Enterprise ERP has been discussed over the past few months - at least to begin to discuss an enterprise application and strategy on it. One of the concerns was to allow CDOT to help the State do something at a bit higher level and if they would be two independent systems, etc. Chairman Picanso went on to say that two concerns came up – one would be to let CDOT continue their implementation, get it stable, get it working well and then, because they're in the midst of it right now, once it's stabilized to have CDOT come in as an advisor, consultant type basis to perhaps begin to talk about a strategy for some other agencies to do ERP from an enterprise perspective.

Doug Lang then said that the "lessons learned" from this project are invaluable as we take a look at where we go from here and IF we go from here. The team that is in place here is very qualified to do that, and is something the State should take advantage of Chairman Picanso agreed and then deferred to Senator May.

Senator May made the point that there may be problems in transportation funding in the next few of years due to Federal withholding more of a percentage then in the past. Which puts pressure on CDOT to do what they already got started with the money that the State provides. "Hopefully you'll be up and running and able to dodge that bullet when it comes." Doug Lang thanked the Senator for making such an excellent point. He then made the point that the ability to manage they're cash flow is a major attractive component of this integrated system. He referred to Director Norton counting on the fact that "we will be able to manage our finances better and overcome some of those challenges you've just described."

Chairman Picanso asked Doug. Lang about the CAR system interface and Doug deferred the question to Andres Kukawka. Chairman Picanso then went on to refer to DPA not proceed in advancing that system on your behalf and how big an issue is that? Andres Kukawka answered by saying that if that were to happen they will still "go live" and develop a manual work around. The issue is that CDOT has a few thousand cars and trucks and approximately 900 state leased cars, one-tons, pick-ups. Those are the ones that are maintained and managed by our mechanics and they will need to provide information to the state in terms of repairs, oil changes etc., for approval. If the interface is not in place, then they will have to do dual entries to the CDOT system, to SAP and to the State. Mr. Kukawka went on to say that the question will be, "Why SAP if these are State systems?" He continued, explaining that in some of those trucks, there is specialized equipment that the State does not provide funding for. The funding for the maintenance on those particular trucks comes out of SAP and needs to be tracked. We also want to track every hour of labor as well, which would also be done through SAP.

Andres Kukawka went on to say that two weeks ago he met with Linda Watson and staff from DPA-DoIT and Art Hill from the State Fleet. They have a plan to develop the interfaces and we are sharing the funding to cover the consulting. The issue is at this late stage, they will deliver the interfaces to us for testing on October 2nd and we're going live on November 1st. If we can't go live on Nov. 1st, then we will start with manual dual entry and go live later.

Chairman Picanso asked for discussion – none followed. He then asked Elain Radford to introduce the next project.

Elain called forward Larry Brooks and Mike Borrego, DPA-DoIT engineers, to present on the Digital Trunk Radio System Project.

Mike Borrego provided a review of their handout, and began by reporting the Project is in GREEN Status.  He offered their website for more detailed information and also pointed out that the project should be completed in the next couple of years.  He continued, going over the budget page and made a special point to say that because they have not been funded for the last two years by the State (budget issues), they have not been able to work on two phases – because of that and the homeland security grants they've been able to secure, they've reduced the State's share to about  $65 million dollars which is about a $13.7 million dollar savings to the State.

CWIN Grant Program:  Summarized the hand-out page 3 and the overwhelming response and DOLA increasing the allocation to over $29 million for 61 new DTR sites.  At this point, Senator May asked if they were up yet, and Mr. Borrego answered no, but he would get to that in a moment.  Target Delivery & Actual Delivery Dates:  Made a special point to mention that a special grant made it possible to complete the San Luis Valley about a year ago, and that the CWIN Grant program is now basically providing the funding to complete the rest of the build out on the Western Slope. Out of the 61 new sites currently funded by the CWIN Grant program, 41 of those sites are on the Western Slope.

KEY Accomplishments:  Mr. Borrego went on to say that there are currently 120 total sites on the air, and the state is divided up into three zones – Zone 1 is the Northeast portion of the state with 51 sites on the air, Zone 2 is the Western Slope and the San Luis Valley with 43 sites and the Northeast corner of the state is Zone 3 with 26 sites. Referring to the the statistic of 500 combined State, Local, Federal and Tribal Government agencies currently operating on DTR statewide with over 25, 385 radios, he made a pointed out that as soon as the Homeland Security Grants are released to the local governments (which should happen within the next 30 days), he expects that number just from the local government side to "take us well above 27- 28,000."   He continued saying that besides the 14 CWIN sites already completed, they anticipate another 17 to 25 sites on the air and operational by the end of this Calendar Year.  He pointed out that the risk there is snow.  Most of these sites are at very high elevations and it depends on how long the snow holds off in terms of how many can be done by the end of the calendar year.

Senator May interjected that they had heard there were several antennas waiting to be done for the snowmelt this last spring, and asked if they were up yet.  Mr. Borrego answered that not all of them were up, because the snow wasn't completely gone until the end of July, and the first part of August. He continued saying that they have most of the buildings, towers and equipment sitting on the ground – it's a matter of manpower and resources to get those all constructed.  "We have had some sites where we're dealing with permits from the Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management and leases from private land-owners."  Senator May asked if he expected them to be complete by the end of December – Mr. Borrego answered that "yes, another 17 to 25 – somewhere in that range by the end of December.  It won't finish – we'll still be doing some of the lower elevation sites during the winter but there will be some in Summit County and some in Eagle County that won't be finished until next summer."

Mr. Borrego went on to say, that one of the key milestones involved the Rainbow Family that came to Arapahoe County. The area they decided at the last minute to move their event to was an area where there was very poor radio coverage, even from the local government standpoint. We were notified at 7:00 pm on Wednesday evening that DOLA had given an emergency grant to the county to build a brand w GTR site. We started mobilizing first thing Thursday morning and because of the buildings and equipment we already had on the ground ready to go with the CWIN Program , we turned up a brand new site in four days. By 4:00 pm that Sunday, we had that site in and operational, working perfectly throughout the entire event.

Mr. Borrego continued saying another key accomplishment is that currently, there are over 5 million radio transmissions monthly and "the number continues to grow." He then went into the issues & concerns – saying that REBANDING (an FCC mandate to re-band all of our DTR 800Mhz frequencies) is the biggest issue and re-capped page 13 of the handout. He continued saying that because the trunked radio system and many trunked radio systems operate in the same band as Nextel, Nextel has been creating interference to many Public Safety radio systems throughout the country. There has been a proceeding going on within the FCC for many years now. With the FCC mandate, all the DTR infrastructure and subscriber units will be swapped with the Nextel frequencies and Nextel will be required to pay the total cost for this. Re-banding implementation is projected to begin late 2006 with completion slated for mid 2007. It will be a massive undertaking because every site – 25,000 to 30,000 will have to be re-visited and re-tuned. This is in the middle of trying to get all the new sites up and running as well.

Senator May asked if there "we can get grant funds for some of it?" and the response was that no grant funds are needed because Nextel is paying 100 % of the costs. Senator May asked then if people would be able to use the radio on both frequencies while the conversion is being done? Mr. Borrego answered that yes, it should be seamless to the users, and went on to say that currently they are working with all of "our users to make sure that their current requirements are met."

He continued, saying that they have submitted a capitol construction budget decision item for the 10.6 million dollars that he mentioned earlier – out of that about 6.5 million will be used to buy the rest of the radios they need for State agencies – 220 thousand dollars will be used to update the State Patrol's dispatch equipment – 191 thousand will be used for test equipment for our radio technicians to keep the system operating and finally 3.5 million for a system and software upgrade. Total cost for that system upgrade is actually be 6.7 million and our local government partners have agreed to contribute about 3.2 million dollars to the project.

Senator May interjected saying that he thought "we passed that in the budget – did it not go through?" Mr. Borrego answered saying that it "did not make it through the process." In closing, Mr. Borrego summarized the maps at then end of the handout which are self-explanatory and stated that the rest of the handout recaps the DTR Statistics.

Commissioner Lutz asked how Colorado stands up in terms of other states? Mr. Borrego said that we are "WAY ahead." Commissioner Lutz then asked if there is one particular state that is "best in class" or states we model after? Mr. Borrego said that the only state that even comes close is the State of Michigan.

Chairman Picanso interjected with the question: Once this build-out is completed with the last submittal to OSPB, "DTR will be finished as I understand it?" Mr. Borrego answered, "Yes and no. It will be finished for the voice portion but if we look at new applications like data transmission over the system and video and other things where we can do that over the same network – because basically the infra-structure network is an IP network." Mr. Borrego continued saying, that the network is available on the infrastructure side for us to start looking at other applications – and that's the next step. Commissioner Malinowski interjected to say that one of his concerns, as the Division Director for this, is that he wants to make certain that we don't wind up with competing networks. He continued saying that part of what he is going to do in terms of a comprehensive look is to see "where do these things come together and where do they need to be separate – clearly, because this is a public network there are some specific things that need to happen. As we continue to see convergence in the industry, there will be other opportunities for us to work together to create some of the same kind of networking."

Commissioner Delmonico interjected saying that this is the best run project she has seen since she has been on the Commission. Senator May asked Mr. Borrego about a "couple of local governments that went in a different direction on their equipment than what we did" and wanted to know who those entities are. Mr. Borrego answered by saying that most of the metropolitan cities chose a different direction because at the time, it met their business and financial requirements: Denver, Aurora, Lakewood, Westminster, West Metro Fire and Arvada are the main users. Last year, through a homeland security grant, Denver was able to secure a device that was an IP gateway called Network First, so that we now have twelve channels tied between DTR and the other systems that are not part of DTR – so we do have interoperability between the two systems. "It's not the best technology – it works, but it is there."

Senator May brought up the point of jurisdictional disputes in terms of interoperability, and he offered to talk to the Deputy Secretary of Homeland Security for grants, whom he recently met with. Mr. Borrego thanked the Senator and continued saying, that one of the points he intended to make along those same lines is that both Larry Brooks and Mike, because of the tremendous job they've done in terms of planning – when grant money has come along, we've been able to quickly identify how it can be spent, and spent appropriately. He then said that they would be delighted to take that grant money and spend it very effectively.

Secretary Dennis interjected with the question of the lack of headings on the last page of the handout - it wasn't clear to her what the numbers represent. Mr. Borrego explained that the first column indicated State Agencies, the second Local Government Agencies and the third would be the Total. Chairman Picanso added to the comment that Senator May made, in that this is also making the radar of other State CIO's throughout the U.S. and there is already discussion on integrating radios regionally so that when we have a multi-state event, how are we going to respond, etc. The Deputy CIO for the government of Canada presented last weekend in talks that Commissioner Picanso attended. He went on to say that they are claiming to have 80% of interoperability for the entire country of Canada that encompasses Public Safety, Royal Mounted Canadian Police and two other

entities.  Commissioner Picanso then said that he would be interested to know when the radio portion of the project is complete and be able to discuss the applications.

Chairman Picanso asked that both these gentlemen be included with that proposal we talked about on the teleconference we had the other day, because there are a lot of initiatives coming out – private entities, non-profit entities, etc., that want to expand the coverage across the rural states to drive applications out to the rural municipalities.  We need to be a little more integrated in the approach and on what "we tell these folks."  Mr. Borrego continued saying that in terms of the adjacent states issue, they are currently working on a Four Corner's interoperability project with Utah, New Mexico and Arizona. We've had a few meetings about how we can use some of the DTR infrastructure of some of the other states – the state of Wyoming is implementing a similar DTR system and we're looking at how we can interconnect the systems.  We're also looking at the surrounding states and talking about how we can at least share infrastructure and interoperability across states.

Senator May expressed an interest in them presenting to ALEC and the Academy on Homeland Security, tentatively to be at the Broadmoor in February.  There will be approximately 100 elected officials from various states all across the nation.  This would be a good place for you to present.

Chairman Picanso asked for any more discussion – no discussion followed.

## III.  NEW BUSINESS:
### A.        Legislative Update (Slide Presentation)

Chairman Picanso: We are going to discuss are three pieces of legislation that have been signed into law by the Governor:  Senate Bill 063, Senate Bill 149 and House Bill S1015.

In going over the slides on SB-063, (*Concerning the procurement of information technology systems, and making an appropriation therefore*) Chairman Picanso made the point that SB 063 gives a lot of responsibility to the Office of Information and Technology through the legislation.  Because of that we are staging up our priorities within OIT to meet the obligations of SB 063, the obligations of SB 149 and HB 1015.  He went on to say that HB 1157 surrounding Cyber Security will be addressed by Mark Weatherford at the October meeting.

Chairman Picanso continued saying that we are beginning to socialize what we believe in OIT and in the IMC "think" this legislation means – it's now effective:  milestones, defining "things like:  "certified, PM, etc., - we have a very aggressive schedule to "figure out" what that is. He cautioned that this is a very dynamic process – we don't have all the answers in OIT – the commission certainly doesn't have all the answers so we expecting to partner with many Stake Holders to get all of this defined.  Some of it will be non-negotiable according to the state of the legislation.

Major automation system development:  Chairman Picanso pointed out that "Major Automation System Development Project" is underlined because we needed to define what that meant – in legislation it was loosely defined.  He went on to discuss the phrase on slide 4 - "significant information technology component, including, without limitation, the

replacement of an existing technological system." Significant means there are four criteria (listed on slide 5) and he specifically pointed out the word "OR" saying, "Not AND but OR" – at the end of each criteria. Chairman Picanso explained that it means that if an agency has a State IT development project under this legislation that meets one of these four criteria outlined on slide # 5, that project will have to come to OIT to be certified. We are obligated through the legislation to certify State IT projects for adherence, and then produce a report to the legislative Body by February 1, 2007. We believe that we read it to mean that current IT projects that are going on right now will role up into this report, and any current projects that will start up around then and continue to the future that we know about will show up on the report as well.

Chairman Picanso went on to the next slide ( #7) defining "Certification." Pointing out that it said State agencies would be "adhering to a Certification Checklist AND (not OR) assigning qualified project management personnel to the project, for the duration of the project." He stressed here that "this is the FIRST DRAFT of what we believe the legislation is – and again this is dynamic and we're starting to sort these out."

He continued with slide # 8 stating that the "Certification Checklist" outlined are examples only – "we're not pursuing these yet but we believe some of these may show up in the checklist at some point – we're going to start around the Project Management Institute guidelines as being the best practices of what some things would be required of our IT projects within the State. " That's kind of the Gold Standard of project supporting metrics – why not have those included as part of our checklist." One example around the PM requirements would be to check the box – "Does this project have a dedicated and qualified PM assigned for the duration of the project?" Chairman Picanso also pointed out that OIT Elain Radford is currently working on the PM portion with DPA Personnel Administration - HR people on the PM portion to develop the Project Management State classified position. They don't exist today, we don't want to make an IT PRO a PM 2 or 3 if they're not qualified. The legislation said "we believe you need a State classified position to be around a Project Manager." So we're working with that in tandem with this legislation and we'll have some certified checklist criteria around those PM requirements. It may need to say, " Is your Project Manager, Project Management Professionally certified – Yes or No?" If no, does your PM have 25 years experience managing projects of this magnitude? – Yes or No?

At this point there was a discussion between Commissioner Monkman and Chairman Picanso regarding agencies coming forward to legislation with a PM whom they feel is qualified/certified and three FTE's appropriated by legistation. Chairman Picanso said that this legislation gave three FTE's to OIT – Elain Radford is the third. He went on to explain that Jim Jones, Doug Sample are contractors. To fulfill the statutory requirement, OIT still has one FTE yet to hire. Because these two gentlemen are contractors, and because we still do not have the State FTE Job Class finished. Commission Picanso then asked the question: "Who would want to come to OIT for four months, when we may be transitioning teams etc.? So, OIT went out and obtained some very highly skilled and competent PM contract resources. What we're going to do with the three FTE's for the duration of the year, is to loan out the resources to the agencies, whether the agency has a certified project or not. We could cost-bill back to the agency if the time required is substantial or the agency can certainly go get they're own PM. Again this is very, very dynamic."

Chairman Picanso then went on to discuss **"**Best Practices Requirements**."** On slide # 8. He went on to say that these are certification items that will have to partner with the agency, because OIT will have the certification authority to certify the project. Senator May asked if there is anything in place for advancement capability for people in our IT departments in terms of training to become certified project managers (PMs).

Chairman Picanso answered saying that the succession path for IT classified professionals to go through the ranks up to PM probably doesn't exist today. "I doubt we will be able to hire Project Managers under State classified positions without being State certified Project managers. This is something we need to talk about." There was some discussion about certification process, re-classification, etc. Chairman Picanso stated that, "We should put a transition process pathway in terms of current employees and advancement opportunities in PM skills." Commissioner Malinowski recognized that this is a deficiency and that each agency is trying to work on this.

Chairman Picanso continued on with "STATUS of a certification can affect funding for IT projects" (slide 9) and explained that this is very, very new and comes directly from THE ACT. "…..the OIT shall certify to the state controller that the project is in compliance with best…" Chairman Picanso went on to break this down on slide #10. If OIT feels that this project does not need to be certified, OIT will not interfere with the funding. The reporting on the project may still be necessary depending on how the Sub-committee feels but this is not clearly defined as yet. He further explained that if the project becomes RED and the Commission has an issue with that project, then the project is acted upon the same as with all RED Status projects. Of course if it is certified we Ok the disbursement of those funds for the project.

Chairman Picanso continued explaining the difference between No Certification and No Certification Necessary: No Certification: Project is currently being certified, and because it is in a state of certification, OIT expects that no funds will be spent towards that project until it becomes certified. Senator May expressed some doubts and confusion at this point on this process saying there is nothing to keep a department from going directly to the JBC even though they haven't been approved through the OSPB. There was some discussion between Chairman Picanso, Senator May and Commissioner Monkman in terms of this process being clearly defined. Chairman Picanso stressed that the report goes directly – nowhere else - to the JBC.

Commissioner Malinowski interjected to say that as he understands this process, even if funds have been appropriated for something that still requires the Controller's office to allow the funds to be spent – they can restrict funds. "If there's not a certification isn't the State Controller's office required to check with OIT ?" Chairman Picanso confirmed that it is exactly what this says – "in conjunction with the State Controller's office." Commissioner Malinowski then went on to say that for example, a department can have funds appropriated, but the State Controller can certainly restrict the use of those funds – the department doesn't get the funds just because they were told they can spend them – from a fiscal point of view, they have to satisfy the requirements, correct? Chairman Picanso confirmed this and thanked Commissioner Malinowski for the clarification. No discussion followed.

Chairman Picanso went on to slide # 11: "Organizational Entity Relationships" (50,000 ft. view) and briefly explained it. He went on to slide # 12 "Process Flow"(10,000 ft. view) and

again briefly went over it. There was some discussion with Senator May again around a project already in process not getting certification - Chairman Picanso pointed out that they would have to discuss how a project got started to begin with that had not gone through the certification process. He continued saying that if the project were 5 million dollars or more, or if it is risky or muti-year or it's multi-agency, that project has to be certified to even start. If that process of certification is circumvented, then we have even "bigger fish to fry!" Chairman Picanso continued saying that the plan is a rigorous process and there will probably be some projects that will not be certified and again this is "dynamic."

Chairman Picanso then opened it up to the Commission and the floor for discussion:

Commissioner VanDerSchouw stated that he would coordinate a phone conversation between the CEO of the Project Management Institute (PMI) and Chairman Picanso. Chairman Picanso concurred this was an excellent suggestion and commented that the certification process will be integrated with the Project Management User's Group (PMUG) efforts.

| Action Item | (Commissioner VanDerSchouw) |
|---|---|

> Commissioner VanDerSchouw will coordinate a conference call between Project Management Institute (PMI) CEO and Chairman Picanso to discuss a project management certification for the State of Colorado.

Senator May asked for clarification regarding IT projects of $100,000 or more included in the IMC Risk Management process for recommendations. Chairman Picanso requested Commissioner Delmonico please address this. Commissioner Delmonico responded that this exact topic was discussed in the Risk Management Subcommittee meeting this morning in terms of what projects should the Subcommittee review, and what projects should present to the full IMC. She stated this topic was discussed in detail and it was decided that once they get their draft, the IMC and the Subcommittee as well, will review and decide whether or not a project of $100,000 or $500,000 be added or not. Do we want to change that matrix we did a long time ago, and how does the IMC want to handle that. Chairman Picanso clarified that OIT reviews any procurement over $100,000 today.

Commissioner Delmonico continued saying that the question is not so much does OIT NOT review the projects but rather how much should we take up the "baton of the IMC' from a huge dollar risk perspective. Once they've defined the rules in terms of what "High Risk" means – because there still may be a $100,000 project that's still considered high risk – then we as a Sub-committee and the IMC can determine what we want to do.

Chairman Picanso interjected at this point saying that we know the IMC Commission had a very rigorous process on how projects came in, got reviewed, got approved, got looked at with OIT etc., now we've got another process that has been defined for all of us and what if they're different – that's what we struggle with. What if the Senate Bill 063 is a more rigorous process than what the Commission is doing, and what if the Commission has a more rigorous process than what the Legislation is asking for? So what we've arrived at today is to try to bring them closer together and apply the same rigor to all projects whether or not they satisfy the certification process.

Commissioner Delmonico agreed, saying that until we determine that in February, we're going to stay just the way we are. We will not change anything we're doing today, until we know what that draft looks like, which will be run by the IMC and the Sub-committee. There was more discussion between Senator May (who still expressed concerns), Chairman Picanso, Commissioner Delmonico and Malinowski. Commissioner Malinowski interjected at this point to address Senator May saying that the bottom line is that "if we don't believe the OIT rules, then we operate independently, and if we don't believe that the OIT structure is sufficient for the IMC's needs then we will create our supplement to that." Everything that is certified will definitely come to us and if we feel we need to be more rigorous, then we will. It is just a matter of what comes before the Sub-committee for risk management and what comes before the IMC. We will review as a group what the OIT comes up with and if we feel as a group that the Commission should review more, then we will propose that.

Commissioner Delmonico said here that "we actually made that comment today in the Sub-committee – that it's really important to get the Legislative input, because there's a lot of questions that the Legislature has to deal with that we don't understand so we want to make sure that we cover that, so I don't think there's a problem." Senator May asked "Who is the Executive Director and his or her CIO going to come before?"

Chairman Picanso interjected to say that they would get to that during the break-out with the Sub-committee reports, referring to the draft of the letter he sent all the Commissioners and said because of that letter and this process, we may want to think that. Commissioner Delmonico said here that they weren't re-thinking the letter so much as that the letter needs to be clarified and make sure the timing of the letter is appropriate for February. She continued saying that all the new executive directors (ED) will have to be trained depending on how many there may or may not be – we want to say, "These are the criteria of when an ED would need to come up. They need to come up if it's a $100,000 project and it's high risk, then it goes to RED.

Senator May then interjected saying that in the "old days" they brought NEW projects and RED Status projects before the Committee. "They used to come before us period." Chairman Picanso thanked them for their comments and addressing Senator May, said "we hear what you're asking and hope to get your concerns addressed." He then urged the Committee to continue going forward with the process and that a Power Point or a document may be sent out that needs to be socialized and sent back, because if we only present each month at the IMC then we're not going to get the certification material finished to run all the projects through and get the report finished by February. "Just a reminder that we're fast-tracking this pretty heavy and hard."

Commissioner Delmonico interjected here to say that the "key carry-out of this" would be that if you want to have another day-long meeting or afternoon meeting with anyone on the commission we'd all be willing to come to to it. She then affirmed Senator May's concerns saying that we want to make sure that we keep some of the old procedures that we had in with that certification process, which is the exact thing we discussed this morning in the Sub-committee – it's just that not everyone remembers all the history. Senator May pointed out that we must keep in mind that this Commission must build a reputation with the JBC in terms of credibility, and that we are their "proctor and guide."

Chairman Picanso at this point moved the meeting forward to discuss Senate Bill 149. (concerning oversight of communications and information resources technologies in state agencies.) He went over the NEW IMC ROLES on slide #15. He stressed that the IMC still has a lot of responsibility. He continued, stressing that the JBC will still come to the IMC for guidance. Chairman Picanso continued on with slide #16 – NEW OIT ROLES: In going over the points he stressed that as opposed to submittals of state agency communications and data processing being given in the past to IMC, these submittals will now be given to OIT. OIT directly receives the state agency plans. He also stressed that SB 149 "directs the State CIO to enforce all of the policies, procedures, standards, guidelines, or criteria that are developed or approved by the State CIO individually or in consultation with other agencies." He continued, making the point that this is a big change – in the past it was the IMC's responsibility to enforce.

Chairman Picanso continued with Slide # 17 "Process Flow" and walked the Commission through the graphics stressing that either the OIT or IMC will initiate a document, a process, a standard – (the IMC makes the rules, so anything other than rules.) If the IMC really thinks they need to initiate something – they initiate it or OIT can initiate it. He then made the point in the action section of the slide that the OIT has NEVER gone against a recommendation of the IMC, but we have the ability to consider the IMC's recommendation in OIT and act upon it – either "pro or con" and then initiate the distribution of that standard, policy, certification checklist, etc. He stressed again that the process flow will not change very much.

Chairman Picanso opened it up to the floor for discussion:

Senator May asked if it was "up and working?" Chairman Picanso confirmed that it was and that it can be fine-tuned if need be. He then went on to say that the reason he started with SB 063, because it is an OIT responsibility, he believes that OIT could be helped significantly with the help of the Commission in "figuring out how all this get's done." He continued, saying that because of the way SB149 is written, it's a really good example of how the Commission can help OIT get SB 063 put in place and working.

No discussion followed and Chairman Picanso then moved on to Slide # 19

House Bill S1015: (Concerning a requirement that a person withhold Colorado income tax from a payment to a person other than an employee for services performed, and making an appropriation therefore.)

Chairman Picanso then went on to explain that this means that OIT has been asked in Legislation to develop a work eligibility verification portal. That's in Statute – OIT has been passed with that under existing resources. On slide #21 Chairman Picanso went over the Target for OIT to provide to the JBC an "Implementation Plan Report" by December 1, 2006. Go Live by January 1, 2008.

Chairman Picanso moved on to Slide # 22 (Current Status) and read over it point by point, implementation plan, strategy and meeting with the Governor's staff on August 22, 2006. He went on to say that this is going to be a very difficult thing. He continued saying that Doug (Sample), Jim (Jones) and he are really working on the 1015 segment. Senator May interjected at this point telling Chairman Picanso to take a look at the way "we did un-insured motorists" over in the Department of Revenue – similar process only much larger. He went

on to say that it was approved through the IMC and they had to contract out – they were unable to do it "in house." There was some discussion about OIT being able to accomplish this "in house" or having the Portal do it. Chairman Picanso said that they have not yet talked with the Portal on this project so it is not known at this point.

Senator May interjected again with "some peripheral issues surrounding this:" He then went on to say that HB 1015 was decided between the Governor, the Senate Leadership and the House and "we were left out of it." There were some items regarding certification of people that has a tremendous effect on the DMV and issuing of drivers licenses and it's requiring an increasing amount of detail/certification documents to be brought in by people to the DMV. He mentioned the long lines and rush of people to the DMV. He continued, saying that this is not an easy problem. Chairman Picanso agreed that it is not. He continued saying that Director Cook from Revenue has been invited will attend the August 22$^{nd}$ meeting, including policy people, AGs office, OSPB etc.

No discussion followed.

## IV. Subcommittee Readouts

### A. Enterprise Architecture (EA) Subcommittee

Commissioner Lutz provided an update on the EA Subcommittee that met this morning. He mentioned that the Statewide Email Consolidation Project is moving but there some funding issues that are being addressed. The DOS - e-FOR$^3$T Project is essentially complete – it will report at the next IMC meeting. However, now that we have the e-FOR$^3$T project so well run and so well established, we already have two agencies who are intending to outsource their disaster recovery external from the State, not considering the e-FOR$^3$T facility to be a suitable third party. He went on to say that he finds that astonishing.

Commissioner Lutz continued and stated there has been very good progress on the End User Computing Standards Specifications efforts, and conveyed the three key issues:
1.  We have a need for the thin plan strategy.
2.  What are we going to do next for the Desk Top Strategy – Commissioner Malinowski agreed that it would be brought up at the CIO Forum as an agenda item.
3.  Vista office – has some potentially significant incompatibilities with the office applications that are currently employed throughout the state, so that particular issue needs to be addressed – Chairman Picanso will be asked officially to join together perhaps with some of the other state CIOs to petition Microsoft with this issue because there is no backward compatibility in many of the programs.

Finally, there is good coordination between Desktop Standards and the office of Information Security and from the IMC EA group – we totally support the End User Computing Standards group to be the ones to declare all standards for any software and hardware.

Discussion followed from Secretary Dennis regarding outsourcing and continuity with projects and making use of available resources already made available throughout the state. Secretary Dennis also made a point to mention the e-FOR$^3$T open house coming up on September 22, and that they have invited all of the executive directors, their deputies, the budget person, their chief information officers, etc.

Commissioner Monkman followed this with some discussion around the climate of resistance in some agencies to make use of the Portal and their need for autonomy within the system – "our own toys, our own way of doing things, etc., and that they have had to put some requirements on moving forward projects that they would at least consider the Portal, etc. Chairman Picanso interjected saying to Secretary Dennis that OIT has made several recommendations to the agencies to try to think about the solutions/services that were already in place. It has been a struggle. He went on to say that he believes that with the way the IMC is structured, with SB 063 plus SB 149, hopefully we can have a larger impact working together in assisting these agencies in terms of not considering the solutions/services that are already in place. He made a point to say that he does not agree with that "recommendation that agency is considering." Secretary of State Dennis interjected here, suggesting that Chairman Picanso use his authority to perhaps write a letter to the JBC, calling it to their attention. Senator May at this point made the point that it was going to take some time, and then remarked on the current success of the Portal.

Commissioner Malinowski agreed with Senator May in terms of it not "happening overnight" but also made the point that time after time, agencies have elected to go outside the existing resources and spend money on other resources, essentially paying twice – once for the existing structure they have and don't use and then again to buy the resource outside. He then went on to say that he believes the "default" should be to enforce the use of existing resources unless the agency/agencies can provide a compelling reason why it doesn't make sense to do that. Chairman Picanso urged the Commission at this point to keep moving forward and remain consistent.

Chairman Picanso then moved the meeting on and asked Commissioner Delmonico to provide a readout on the IT Risk Management/Security Subcommittee.

**B. IT Risk Management Subcommittee**
Commissioner Delmonico reported that the IT Risk Management Subcommittee met this morning and discussed details of a number of different projects. Commissioner Delmonico thanked Chairman Picanso for his quick response letter for the action item regarding having the executive directors come present in front of the Commission. She further stated that once they started talking to the CIOs they expressed concern. The decision and recommendation from the Risk Management Subcommittee is to hold off sending that letter and instead, include it as part of the education process that will be occurring with the new executive directors coming in, along with SB 063.

There was some discussion with Senator May asking how this will all work with the "transition team" and Commissioner Malinowski responded by saying that the incoming Governor sets up teams to cover a variety of areas and each department prepares a briefing book – in this case the OIT would provide a briefing book and they would meet with the transition team and talk through particular issues. He went on to say that normally every department identifies key issues that they want to discuss. Commissioner Delmonico said at this point that they were fine with Chairman Picanso delaying the letter that will now be included in a "briefing book."

Chairman Picanso made a special point to mention that a high priority of OIT is to leave behind a physical portfolio of documents that explain what the OIT considers to be important to the state, projects OIT considers to be important to the state, and here are some things that would assist a new team coming in to start on the "right foot in our own opinion." It was then suggested that a letter be sent to each campaign office asking them to consider an IT transition team as part of

their campaign. Commissioner Malinowski stated he has a DPA-DoIT transition plan that he will send to the OIT and IMC for review. Commissioner Malinowski also volunteered to draft a letter for communicating IT transition to each campaign office and will send that to all the IMC.

| Action Item | (Commissioner Malinowski) |
|---|---|

Commissioner Malinowski will send the DPA-DoIT transition plan to the OIT and IMC for review, and will draft a letter for communicating IT transition to each campaign office and send that to all the IMC.

Commissioner Delmonico then continued with item two of the risk management committee regarding CSTARS which has been reporting monthly since they became YELLOW status. They have indicated that they will be able to do their first implementation of statewide capability over the Labor Day weekend. She made the point that in the past this has been a "soft date" and that it needs to be a date they are willing to commit to. Should that date be missed, in order to be consistent with in the way the Commission manages it's red, yellow and green status, it is being recommended that CSTARS project will then go into RED status at that time.

There was some discussion from Senator May around DOR and Taxes and that it must be tracked closely. He made the point that Director Cook is a good manager.

**C. Policy / Portfolio Subcommittees**
None. Meeting cancelled.

## Adjournment
Chairman Picanso adjourned the meeting at 4:42PM.

_____

The next IMC will be held on:
Friday, September 15, 2006
1:30pm – 4:00pm
Legislative Services Building – Hearing Room A
200 E. 14th Avenue
Denver, CO 80203